

Efficiency of Deterministic Entanglement Transformation

Runyao Duan,^{1,*} Yuan Feng,^{1,†} Zhengfeng Ji,^{1,‡} and Mingsheng Ying^{1,§}

¹*State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and Systems,
Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, 100084*
(Dated: February 1, 2008)

We prove that sufficiently many copies of a bipartite entangled pure state can always be transformed into some copies of another one with certainty by local quantum operations and classical communication. The efficiency of such a transformation is characterized by deterministic entanglement exchange rate, and it is proved to be always positive and bounded from top by the infimum of the ratios of Renyi's entropies of source state and target state. A careful analysis shows that the deterministic entanglement exchange rate cannot be increased even in the presence of catalysts. As an application, we show that there can be two incomparable states with deterministic entanglement exchange rate strictly exceeding 1.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud

I. INTRODUCTION

As a valuable resource in quantum information processing, quantum entanglement has been widely used in quantum cryptography [1], quantum superdense coding [2], and quantum teleportation [3]. Consequently, it remains the subject of interest at present after years of investigations. Since quantum entanglement often exists between different subsystems of a composite system shared by spatially separated parties, a natural constraint on the manipulation of entanglement is that the separated parties are only allowed to perform quantum operations on their own subsystems and to communicate to each other classically (LOCC). Using this restricted set of transformations, the parties are often required to optimally manipulate the nonlocal resources contained in the initial entangled state.

A central problem about quantum entanglement is thus to find the conditions of when a given entangled state can be transformed into another one via LOCC. This problem can be solved in two different, but complementary, contexts: the finite regime and the asymptotic regime. In asymptotic regime, Bennett *et al.* proposed in Ref. [4] a reversible protocol which shows that infinite copies of a given bipartite entangled pure state $|\psi_1\rangle$ can always be transformed by LOCC into another given bipartite entangled pure state $|\psi_2\rangle$ with ratio $\frac{H(|\psi_1\rangle)}{H(|\psi_2\rangle)}$, where $H(|\psi\rangle)$ is the entropy of entanglement of $|\psi\rangle$. The first important step of entanglement transformation in the finite regime was made by Nielsen in Ref. [5], where he presented the condition of two bipartite entangled pure states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ with the property that $|\psi_1\rangle$ can be locally converted into $|\psi_2\rangle$ deterministically. More precisely, Nielsen proved that the transformation $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ can be achieved with certainty by LOCC if and only

if the Schmidt coefficient vector of $|\psi_1\rangle$ is majorized by that of $|\psi_2\rangle$. Nielsen's result has been extended in several ways to the case where deterministic local transformation cannot be achieved [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. These efforts also lead to the surprising phenomenon of entanglement catalysis [9]. Unlike the asymptotic regime, it has been shown that during the entanglement manipulation some nonlocal properties of the system are irreversibly lost, and that entanglement does not behave as an additive resource in the finite regime.

This paper considers an interesting problem which in a sense can be thought of as a combination of the finite regime and the asymptotic regime. Suppose that two parties share m copies of entangled pure state $|\psi_1\rangle$, and want to deterministically transform them into some copies of another state $|\psi_2\rangle$ by LOCC. Let $f(m)$ be the maximal number of copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$ they can obtain. Then the deterministic entanglement exchange rate $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ may be defined as the optimal ratio $\frac{f(m)}{m}$, where m ranges over all positive integers. The main aim of this paper is to evaluate $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. This problem has some features of the asymptotic regime in the sense that the number of copies of the source state is sufficiently large. On the other hand, it also shares some properties with transformations in the finite regime since they need the transformation to be implemented with certainty.

In this paper we mainly consider the case of bipartite entangled pure states. First, we are able to prove that the deterministic entanglement exchange rate $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ is always positive, which means that sufficiently many copies of an entangled pure state $|\psi_1\rangle$ always can be transformed into some copies of another entangled pure one. Second, we define the entropy ratio $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ to be the infimum of ratios of Renyi's entropies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$. Then it is shown that $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ is bounded from top by $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. Furthermore, we examine a special case. If the target state $|\psi_2\rangle$ is maximally entangled, then the upper bound can be achieved. Indeed, an analytical formula for calculating $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ is given.

A somewhat surprising thing comes up when we consider the influence of catalysis on the deterministic entanglement exchange rate. It is demonstrated that

*Electronic address: dry02@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

†Electronic address: feng-y@tsinghua.edu.cn

‡Electronic address: jizhengfeng98@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

§Electronic address: yingmsh@tsinghua.edu.cn

$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ cannot be enhanced even allowing extra entangled states to serve as catalysts. In other words, entanglement catalysis has no effect on the deterministic entanglement exchange rate. Nevertheless, we show that a catalyst state is also useful since sometimes it can help us to obtain better lower bounds of deterministic entanglement exchange rate easily.

As applications, we also present some concrete examples. In particular, we show an interesting phenomenon: there exist two states with deterministic entanglement exchange rate strictly larger than 1 though they are incomparable under LOCC. More explicitly, although $|\psi_1\rangle$ cannot be transformed into $|\psi_2\rangle$ directly under LOCC, sometimes it is still possible to transform m copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ into n copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$ with $n > m$. In some sense, this phenomenon confirms that it is reasonable to use the notion of deterministic entanglement exchange rate to characterize the efficiency of deterministic transformation under LOCC.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we formally introduce the notion of deterministic entanglement exchange rate $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$, and prove that this quantity is positive and bounded from top by $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. A formula of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ when $|\psi_2\rangle$ is maximally entangled is also presented in Sec. II. Next, in Sec. III, the relation between entanglement catalysis and deterministic entanglement exchange rate is examined carefully. As applications, some concrete examples are given in Sec. IV. We draw a brief conclusion together with some open problems for further study in Sec. V.

II. DETERMINISTIC ENTANGLEMENT EXCHANGE RATE AND ENTROPY RATIO

Let $|\psi_1\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\alpha_i} |i\rangle |i\rangle$ be an entangled pure state with ordered Schmidt coefficients $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n \geq 0$. We use the symbol λ_{ψ_1} to denote the ordered Schmidt coefficient vector of $|\psi_1\rangle$, i.e., $\lambda_{\psi_1} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, which is just an n -dimensional probability vector. Let $|\psi_2\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\beta_i} |i\rangle |i\rangle$ be a pure state with ordered Schmidt coefficient vector $\lambda_{\psi_2} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$. We say that λ_{ψ_1} is majorized by λ_{ψ_2} , denoted by $\lambda_{\psi_1} \prec \lambda_{\psi_2}$, if the sum of l largest components of λ_{ψ_1} is not greater than that of λ_{ψ_2} for each $l = 1, \dots, \min(m, n)$. We write $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ if $|\psi_1\rangle$ can be deterministically transformed into $|\psi_2\rangle$ under LOCC.

Using the above notations, Nielsen's theorem [5] can be stated as follows: $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ if and only if $\lambda_{\psi_1} \prec \lambda_{\psi_2}$.

By Nielsen's theorem, to determine whether $|\psi_1\rangle$ can be transformed into $|\psi_2\rangle$ under LOCC, it suffices to check $\min\{m, n\}$ inequalities. If $|\psi_2\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state, then we need only to check one inequality.

Lemma 1 Let $|\psi_1\rangle$ be an entangled state with the largest Schmidt coefficient α_1 , and let $|\Phi_k\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{i=1}^k |i\rangle |i\rangle$ be a maximally entangled state. Then $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\Phi_k\rangle$ if and only if $\alpha_1 \leq \frac{1}{k}$.

Proof. Immediately from the definition of majorization and Nielsen's theorem. $\square$

Suppose now that $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are two entangled states, we define $f(m)$ by the maximal positive integer n such that $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m}$ can be transformed into $|\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes n}$ by LOCC, i.e.,

$$f(m) = \max\{n : |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes n}\}. \quad (1)$$

If the set on the right-hand side of Eq.(1) is empty, we simply set $f(m)$ to zero. Now the *deterministic entanglement exchange rate* from $|\psi_1\rangle$ to $|\psi_2\rangle$, denoted by $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$, is defined as the supremum of ratios of $f(m)$ and m for any positive integer m , i.e.,

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \sup_{m \geq 1} \frac{f(m)}{m}. \quad (2)$$

Intuitively, for a sufficiently large m , we can transform m copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ exactly into $mD(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$ by LOCC.

It may be instructive to clarify the difference between the deterministic entanglement exchange rate introduced above and the asymptotic entanglement exchange rate considered by Bennett *et al.* Recall from [4] that the asymptotic entanglement exchange rate, denoted by $E^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$, is given by

$$E^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \frac{H(|\psi_1\rangle)}{H(|\psi_2\rangle)}, \quad (3)$$

where $H(|\psi_1\rangle) = -\sum \alpha_i \log_2 \alpha_i$ is the entropy of entanglement of $|\psi_1\rangle$. The quantity $E^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ has a nice physical meaning. In fact, for a sufficiently large m , we can approximately transform m copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ into $mE^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$. Here 'approximately' means that the resulted state is a good approximation of $|\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes mE^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)}$ in the sense that the fidelity between them tends to one with high probability when m tends to infinity. On the other hand, as we just mentioned, we can transform m copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ exactly into $mD(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$ by LOCC for a sufficiently large m . Thus, although both $E^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ and $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ are defined in an asymptotic sense, the former characterizes the efficiency of approximate entanglement transformation, while the later represents the efficiency of deterministic entanglement transformation. We will see later that $E^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ is an upper bound of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ and in some special cases these two quantities coincide. In the rest of present paper, we investigate properties of the deterministic entanglement exchange rate carefully.

First, one can easily check that the deterministic entanglement exchange rate defined above has the following interesting properties:

Lemma 2 If $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$ and $|\psi_3\rangle$ are three entangled pure states, then

1. $D(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes p}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes q}) = \frac{p}{q} D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$.
2. $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \cdot D(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle) \leq D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle)$. Especially, $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) D(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle) \leq 1$.

3. $D(|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle) \geq D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle) + D(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle)$.
4. $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq 1$ and $D(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle) \geq 1$ if and only if $\lambda_{\psi_1} = \lambda_{\psi_2}$.

It would be desirable to know the precise value of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. However, unlike the asymptotic entanglement exchange rate, we still don't know how to compute the deterministic entanglement exchange rate at present. Nevertheless, we can obtain a lower bound and an upper bound of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$, respectively.

Before proving these two bounds, let us review some elements of Renyi's entropy [14]. Recall that the τ -order Renyi's entropy of $|\psi_1\rangle$ is defined by

$$S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle) = \frac{1}{1-\tau} \log_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^\tau, \text{ for any } \tau > 0 \text{ and } \tau \neq 1, \quad (4)$$

where $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is the ordered Schmidt coefficient vector of $|\psi_1\rangle$. For the sake of convenience, let $S^{(0)}(|\psi_1\rangle) = \log_2 d$, $S^{(1)}(|\psi_1\rangle) = H(|\psi_1\rangle)$, and $S^{(+\infty)}(|\psi_1\rangle) = -\log_2 \alpha_1$, where d is the number of non-zero Schmidt coefficients of $|\psi_1\rangle$. It is easy to verify that $S^{(\tau)}(|\psi\rangle)$ is continuous and bounded for any $\tau \in [0, +\infty]$.

Renyi's entropy enjoys many useful properties. The most interesting one is the additivity under tensor product. That is, $S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle) = S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle) + S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_2\rangle)$. Especially, $S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m}) = mS^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle)$ for any positive integer m . It is also worth noting that Renyi's entropy does not increase under LOCC. So, $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ implies $S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle) \geq S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_2\rangle)$.

Now we can use Renyi's entropy to define a quantity $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ as follows:

$$R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \inf_{\tau \geq 0} \frac{S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle)}{S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_2\rangle)}. \quad (5)$$

That is, $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ is the infimum of the ratios of the Renyi's entropies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$. We name this useful quantity the 'entropy ratio' of $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$.

It is easy to prove that $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ has the following properties:

Lemma 3 If $|\psi_1\rangle$, $|\psi_2\rangle$ and $|\psi_3\rangle$ are three entangled pure states, then

1. $R(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes p}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes q}) = \frac{p}{q} R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$.
2. $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) R(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle) \leq R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle)$. Especially, $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) R(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle) \leq 1$.
3. $R(|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle) \geq R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle) + R(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_3\rangle)$.
4. $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq 1$ and $R(|\psi_2\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle) \geq 1$ if and only if $\lambda_{\psi_1} = \lambda_{\psi_2}$.
5. there exists $\tau_0 \in [0, +\infty]$ such that $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \frac{S^{(\tau_0)}(|\psi_1\rangle)}{S^{(\tau_0)}(|\psi_2\rangle)}$.

Comparing Lemmas 2 and 3, one can see that $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ and $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ enjoy many similar properties. Indeed, the former serves as an upper bound on the latter, as the following theorem indicates:

Theorem 1 If $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are two entangled states, then

$$0 < D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle).$$

Proof. To prove the first inequality, we only need to show that for some positive integer m , $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$, which yields $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq \frac{1}{m} > 0$. Without loss of generality, let $|\psi_2\rangle$ be an $n \times n$ state, and $|\Phi_n\rangle$ an $n \times n$ maximally entangled state. It is obvious that $|\Phi_n\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$. We shall show that by a careful choice of m we have $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\Phi_n\rangle$, thus $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$. In fact, let α_1 be the maximal component of λ_{ψ_1} . Then, since $|\psi_1\rangle$ is an entangled state, it follows that $0 < \alpha_1 < 1$. Hence it is always possible to take an m such that $\alpha_1^m \leq \frac{1}{n}$. Applying Lemma 1 leads us to $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\Phi_n\rangle$.

To deal with the second inequality, we utilize the above argument which states that for some sufficiently large m , $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes f(m)}$ and $f(m) \geq 1$. By the properties of Renyi's entropy mentioned above, it follows that $mS^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle) \geq f(m)S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_2\rangle)$, or

$$\frac{f(m)}{m} \leq \frac{S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_1\rangle)}{S^{(\tau)}(|\psi_2\rangle)}. \quad (6)$$

Then the second inequality holds by taking supremum according to m on the left-hand side and infimum according to τ on the right-hand side of the above formula, respectively. $\square$

By the definition of entropy ratio, we have $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq E^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. Hence an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 is that $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq E^{asy}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. In other words, the asymptotic entanglement exchange rate considered in Ref. [4] serves as an upper bound of the deterministic entanglement exchange rate.

Theorem 1 deserves some more remarks. First, $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) > 0$ reveals a fundamental property of entangled pure states. That is, any two entangled pure states are interconvertible in the sense that sufficiently many copies of one state can always be exactly transformed into some copies of another state by LOCC [15]. Although this seems very reasonable, it is not all obvious that it should be the case. Since it is well known that for mixed states, there exist bounded entangled states that cannot be concentrated into a singlet even asymptotically [16]. Moreover, as shown in Ref. [17], the maximal conversion probability of a generic mixed state to an entangled pure state is always zero. Thus entangled pure states can be treated as the most valuable entanglement resources, and they are interconvertible under LOCC. Second, the theorem also indicates that $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ is an upper bound of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. Whether this bound is tight or not is still unknown. In the following, we shall further investigate the property of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$, and it will be shown that in some special but interesting cases, this upper bound can be achieved.

In particular, if target state is maximally entangled, we are able to calculate deterministic entanglement ex-

change rate explicitly, which coincides with the upper bound presented above.

Theorem 2 If $|\psi_1\rangle$ is an entangled state with the greatest Schmidt coefficient α_1 , and $|\Phi_k\rangle$ is a $k \times k$ maximally entangled state, then $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\Phi_k\rangle) = -\log_k \alpha_1$.

Proof. By Theorem 1, for a sufficiently large positive integer m , it holds that $f(m) \geq 1$. Moreover, by the definition of $f(m)$, it follows that

$$|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\Phi_k\rangle^{\otimes f(m)} \quad (7)$$

but

$$|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \not\rightarrow |\Phi_k\rangle^{\otimes f(m)+1}. \quad (8)$$

From Lemma 1, Eqs. (7) and (8) are equivalent to

$$\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{f(m)+1} < \alpha_1^m \leq \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{f(m)}, \quad (9)$$

or

$$-\log_k \alpha_1 - \frac{1}{m} < \frac{f(m)}{m} \leq -\log_k \alpha_1. \quad (10)$$

With m tending to $+\infty$, we have $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\Phi_k\rangle) = -\log_k \alpha_1$. $\square$

We notice that the problem of deterministic concentration of Bell pairs from a finite number of partially entangled pairs was considered in Ref. [18]. As a natural extension of the solution of problem, the quantity $-\log_k \alpha_1$ was treated there as an entanglement measure of state $|\psi_1\rangle$. It is clear that the precise meaning of this quantity is the deterministic entanglement exchange rate $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\Phi_k\rangle)$.

Except for some trivial cases, the transformations in the finite regime is always irreversible in the sense some entanglement is lost during the manipulation [5, 6, 10, 18]. Interestingly, if sufficiently many copies of source state are available, sometimes we may do entanglement transformation deterministically without loss of entanglement. For example, by Theorem 2,

$$D(|\Phi_{k_1}\rangle, |\Phi_{k_2}\rangle) = \frac{1}{D(|\Phi_{k_2}\rangle, |\Phi_{k_1}\rangle)} = \log_{k_2} k_1. \quad (11)$$

In other words, if both source state and target state are maximally entangled, then the deterministic entanglement exchange rate coincides with the asymptotic entanglement exchange rate. Thus in this special case the transformation can be reversible.

III. ENTANGLEMENT CATALYSIS AND DETERMINISTIC ENTANGLEMENT EXCHANGE RATE

In this section, we examine the relation between entanglement catalysis and deterministic entanglement exchange rate. More precisely, we will answer the following

question: can the deterministic entanglement exchange rate be increased by introducing catalysts?

We say that $|\psi_1\rangle$ can be catalyzed into $|\psi_2\rangle$ if there exists a state $|\phi\rangle$ such that $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle$. This kind of transformation is often called *entanglement-assisted local transformation*, abbreviated by ELOCC [9]. And the state $|\phi\rangle$ is called a catalyst for the transformation. Since an ELOCC transformation is always not less, and sometimes strictly more, powerful than a LOCC transformation, the deterministic entanglement exchange rate may be increased by allowing extra states to serve as catalysts. However, we shall prove that it is not the case.

To be concise, we define the notion of deterministic entanglement exchange rate under ELOCC. More precisely, suppose that $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are two given states, we define $f'(m)$ as the maximum n such that $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m}$ can be catalyzed into $|\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes n}$. That is,

$$f'(m) = \max\{n : \exists |\phi\rangle \text{ s.t. } |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \otimes |\phi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes n} \otimes |\phi\rangle\}. \quad (12)$$

If the set on the right-hand side of Eq.(12) is empty, we simply set $f'(m)$ to zero. Now the *entanglement-assisted deterministic entanglement exchange rate* from $|\psi_1\rangle$ to $|\psi_2\rangle$ can be defined as

$$D^c(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \sup_{m \geq 1} \frac{f'(m)}{m}, \quad (13)$$

where the superscript c denotes ‘‘catalyst-assisted transformation’’. Intuitively, for a sufficiently large m , $mD^c(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ denotes the maximal number of the copies $|\psi_2\rangle$ that can be deterministically obtained from m copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ by ELOCC.

Now the relation between entanglement catalysis and deterministic entanglement exchange rate is summarized by the following:

Theorem 3 If $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are two entangled states, then $D^c(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$.

In other words, deterministic entanglement exchange rate cannot be increased by entanglement-assisted transformation. The proof we will give in the following indicates that this result also holds in the multipartite setting though the existence of multipartite catalyst is still unknown.

To prove the above theorem, we need a useful lemma. This lemma also shows some connection between entanglement catalysis and the deterministic entanglement exchange rate.

Lemma 4 If $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ under ELOCC, then $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq 1$.

Proof. By assumption, there exists a state $|\phi\rangle$ such that

$$|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle. \quad (14)$$

From Theorem 1, we can find a constant m_0 such that

$$|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m_0} \rightarrow |\phi\rangle. \quad (15)$$

Now suppose that we have m copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$, where $m > m_0$. The following protocol shows that $f(m) \geq m - m_0$:
 Step 1. perform $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes(m-m_0)} \otimes |\phi\rangle$;
 Step 2. perform $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes(m-m_0)} \otimes |\phi\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes(m-m_0)} \otimes |\phi\rangle$.

Step 1 is a simple use of Eq. (15), and step 2 can be realized by using Eq. (14) ($m - m_0$) times.

By the definition of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$, it follows that

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \sup_{m \geq 1} \frac{f(m)}{m} \geq \sup_{m > m_0} \frac{m - m_0}{m} = 1.$$

That completes the proof of this lemma. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3. For a sufficiently large m , we have $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes f'(m)}$ under ELOCC. Thus, by Lemma 4, it follows that

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes f'(m)}) \geq 1.$$

Furthermore, from (1) of Lemma 2, we have

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \frac{f'(m)}{m} D(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m}, |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes f'(m)}).$$

Combining the above two equations, we derive

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq \frac{f'(m)}{m}$$

for any positive integer m . Taking supremum according to m yields

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq D^c(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle).$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq D^c(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle).$$

That completes our proof. $\square$

As a direct implication of Theorems 1 and 3, we have the following:

Corollary 1 If $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ under ELOCC and $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$, then $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$.

Some special cases of Corollary 1 are of great interest. Suppose that $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ by ELOCC, then $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$ if these two states share the same greatest Schmidt coefficient or if they have the same number of nonzero Schmidt coefficients.

IV. SOME APPLICATIONS

In this section, we give some concrete examples. First, the problem of calculating deterministic entanglement exchange rate of two 2×2 entangled pure states is considered. We present some partial results about this problem in the following example.

Example 1 Let $|\psi_1\rangle = \sqrt{p}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|11\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle = \sqrt{q}|00\rangle + \sqrt{1-q}|11\rangle$, where $\frac{1}{2} < p, q < 1$. Our aim here is to calculate $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$.

If $p \leq q$, then it is easy to verify that $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ and $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$. Thus $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$.

The case of $p > q$ is much more complicated and it seems too difficult to give a precise expression of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. We consider a special case here. If there is some positive real μ such that $p = \mu^m$ and $q = \mu^n$, where $m = 1, 2, 3$ and $n > m$. Then $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \frac{m}{n}$.

In fact, under the assumptions, a direct calculation carries out that $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes n} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes m}$, thus $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq \frac{m}{n}$. On the other hand,

$$R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq \frac{S^{(+\infty)}(|\psi_1\rangle)}{S^{(+\infty)}(|\psi_2\rangle)} = \frac{m}{n}.$$

By Theorem 1, it follows that $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = \frac{m}{n}$. $\square$

Nielsen's theorem implies that there are incomparable states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ in the sense neither $|\psi_1\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$ nor $|\psi_2\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_1\rangle$. Thus the maximal conversion probability between two incomparable state is strictly less than 1. The well-known effects of entanglement catalysis or multiple-copy entanglement transformation [10, 11, 12] can help us to transform some copies of source state $|\psi_1\rangle$ into the same number of copies of target state $|\psi_2\rangle$. We further ask: can we obtain more copies of target state than source state? To one's surprise, the answer for this question is yes. Specifically, the following example indicates that there can be incomparable states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ such that $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) > 1$. It also shows that sometimes a catalyst state can help us to obtain a more precise lower bound of deterministic entanglement exchange rate.

Example 2 Let $|\psi_1\rangle = \sqrt{0.40}|00\rangle + \sqrt{0.36}|11\rangle + \sqrt{0.14}|22\rangle + \sqrt{0.10}|33\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle = \sqrt{0.50}|00\rangle + \sqrt{0.25}|11\rangle + \sqrt{0.25}|22\rangle$. It is obvious that $|\psi_1\rangle \nrightarrow |\psi_2\rangle$. However, one can easily check that $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes k} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes k}$ for any $k \geq 2$. This is just the effect of multiple-copy entanglement transformation. The most interesting thing here is that $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 8} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 9}$ by Nielsen's theorem. Thus, $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq 9/8$.

By Theorem 3, we have known that entanglement catalysis cannot increase the deterministic entanglement exchange rate. But a catalyst state is still useful in the sense that it can help us to obtain more precise lower bound of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$. In fact, since $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 7}$ and $|\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 8}$ are LOCC incomparable, we seek for a potential catalyst to help the transformation. Taking $|\phi\rangle = \sqrt{0.60}|44\rangle + \sqrt{0.40}|55\rangle$, by a routine calculation, we have

$$|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 7} \otimes |\phi\rangle^{\otimes 4} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes 8} \otimes |\phi\rangle^{\otimes 4},$$

where $|\phi\rangle$ is called a multiple-copy catalyst for the transformation from $|\psi_1\rangle$ to $|\psi_2\rangle$ [11]. Thus $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq 8/7$ from Theorem 3. So, a more precise lower bound of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ is obtained.

From the above argument, one may naturally ask: is it possible to obtain a more precise lower bound of

$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ by transforming 6 copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ into 7 copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$? Unfortunately, since

$$R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq \frac{S^{(2)}(|\psi_1\rangle)}{S^{(2)}(|\psi_2\rangle)} = 1.1643 < 7/6,$$

it is impossible to transform 6 copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ into 7 copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$ by Theorem 1. $\square$

A catalyst state may also help us to achieve the upper bound of $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ easily. We demonstrate this point in the following example.

Example 3 Take source state and target state as $|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1.01}}(\sqrt{0.4}|00\rangle + \sqrt{0.4}|11\rangle + \sqrt{0.1}|22\rangle + \sqrt{0.1}|33\rangle + \sqrt{0.01}|44\rangle)$ and $|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1.01}}(\sqrt{0.5}|00\rangle + \sqrt{0.25}|11\rangle + \sqrt{0.2}|22\rangle + \sqrt{0.05}|33\rangle + \sqrt{0.01}|44\rangle)$, respectively.

By Remark 1 in Ref. [13], we have $|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes m}$ for any positive integer m . Thus $f(m) < m$ for any m , which yields $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq 1$ and any finite m cannot attain the upper bound $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$. Now if we take $|\phi\rangle = \sqrt{0.6}|55\rangle + \sqrt{0.4}|66\rangle$, then a simple calculation carries out that $|\phi\rangle$ is a multiple-copy catalyst for the transformation from $|\psi_1\rangle$ to $|\psi_2\rangle$, since it holds that

$$|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle^{\otimes 11} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle^{\otimes 11}.$$

Applying Lemma 4, we have $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq 1$. Therefore, it holds that $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$, and this value can be attained by transforming $|\psi_1\rangle$ into $|\psi_2\rangle$ with the aid of the catalyst state $|\phi\rangle^{\otimes 11}$. $\square$

The last example is aimed to demonstrate the difference between probabilistic transformation and deterministic transformation.

Example 4 Take $|\psi_1\rangle = \sqrt{0.4}|00\rangle + \sqrt{0.4}|11\rangle + \sqrt{0.2}|22\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle = \sqrt{0.5}|00\rangle + \sqrt{0.25}|11\rangle + \sqrt{0.25}|22\rangle$.

It is obvious that $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ are incomparable even under ELOCC [9]. Furthermore, the maximal conversion probability [6] is given by

$$P_{\max}(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes k} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes k}) = 0.8^k,$$

which is exponentially decreasing when k increases [10].

On the other hand, we have $R(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = 1$. By Theorem 1, it holds that $D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \leq 1$. A numerical calculation leads to

$$|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes m} \rightarrow |\psi_2\rangle^{\otimes m-1}$$

for each $m = 2, 3, \dots, 100$, which yields

$$D(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) \geq 0.99.$$

That is, by a probabilistic manner, we have only a very small probability to obtain 100 copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$ from the same number of $|\psi_2\rangle$; while by a deterministic manner, we can obtain 99 copies of $|\psi_2\rangle$ from 100 copies of $|\psi_1\rangle$. $\square$

V. CONCLUSION

To summarize, we introduce the notion of deterministic entanglement exchange rate to characterize the degree of convertibility of two entangled pure states. This quantity has a very clear intuitive meaning: it denotes the optimal ratio of the number of copies of target state and source state under deterministic LOCC. We prove that this rate is always positive, and it is bounded from top by entropy ratio. In the special case that the target state is maximally entangled, this upper bound can be achieved. We further prove that even allowing extra states to serve as catalysts, the deterministic entanglement exchange rate cannot be increased. We give some concrete examples to illustrate the application of the main results. Especially, we demonstrate that there can be two incomparable entangled states with deterministic entanglement exchange rate larger than one. We also show that a catalyst can help us in obtaining more precise lower bounds of deterministic entanglement exchange rate.

There are still many open problems for further studies. The most interesting one is to determine the achievability of the upper bound of deterministic entanglement exchange rate. We believe that such an upper bound can always be achieved in general.

Acknowledgement: The authors wish to thank X. Li for helpful discussions about majorization. The acknowledgement is also given to the colleagues in the Quantum Computation and Quantum Information Research Group. This work was partly supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos: 60273003, 60433050, 60321002, and 60305005). Especially, Runyao Duan acknowledges the financial support of a PhD Student Creative Foundation of Tsinghua University (Grant No: 052420003).

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India, 1984, pp. 175 – 179.
 - [2] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2881 (1992).
 - [3] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895

- (1993).
- [4] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A 53, 2046 (1996).
- [5] M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 436 (1999).
- [6] G. Vidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1046 (1999).
- [7] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1455 (1999).

- [8] G. Vidal, D. Jonathan, and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A 62, 012304 (2000).
- [9] D. Jonathan and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3566 (1999).
- [10] S. Bandyopadhyay, V. Roychowdhury, and U. Sen, Phys. Rev. A 65, 052315 (2002).
- [11] R. Y. Duan, Y. Feng, X. Li, and M. S. Ying, quant-ph/0312010.
- [12] R. Y. Duan, Y. Feng, X. Li, and M. S. Ying, quant-ph/0404148. (To be published in Phys. Rev. A)
- [13] Y. Feng, R. Y. Duan, and M. S. Ying, quant-ph/0312110.
- [14] A. Renyi, *Probability Theory*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970.
- [15] This property is recently proved to be true for a class of general multipartite entangled pure states, see Z. F. Ji, R. Y. Duan, and M. S. Ying, Phys. Lett. A 330, 418-423 (2004).
- [16] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 5239 (1998).
- [17] A. Kent, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2839 (1998).
- [18] F. Morikoshi and M. Koashi, Phys. Rev. A 64, 022316 (2001).